

REMARKS

Claims 31 - 36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof.

Claims 1, 12, 16 and 20 have been amended.

Claims 1 – 30 are present in the subject application.

In the Office Action dated September 7, 2005, the Examiner has rejected claims 16 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. §101 and has rejected claims 1 – 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Favorable reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

In particular, the Examiner has rejected claims 16 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed toward non-statutory subject matter, has rejected claims 1 – 9, 11 – 28 and 30 – 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,263 (Liu), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,700 (Kanevsky et al.), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,418 (Carter et al.), and has rejected claims 10 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the Liu, Kanevsky et al., and Carter et al. patents and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,341,426 (Barney et al.).

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended by Examiner Pyzocha during the interview of November 14, 2005. The interview included discussions of the rejection of claims 16 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. §101 and of a proposed claim amendment in view of the rejection of claims 1 - 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Specifically, the Examiner indicated that claims 16 - 19 are directed toward a carrier signal which the Examiner considers to be non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner further indicated that amending independent claim 16 to recite the carrier

signal having computer program logic embedded therein causing an apparatus to facilitate the secure communications would be considered to be statutory subject matter.

With respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicant submitted a proposed independent claim 1 amended to recite the features of a system for facilitating secure encrypted communications over a network with a network interface configured to provide unencrypted sessions with web sites, a security module to detect a secure web site providing encrypted sessions, the security related information including information enabling a secure encrypted session with the secure web site, the security information including information enabling negotiation of parameters for secure encrypted sessions with secure web sites, the security system processing for the network interface identified security information to enable the secure encrypted session and the negotiation module to negotiate communication parameters with the secure web site utilizing the retrieved security information to facilitate the secure encrypted session between that site and the voice browser. Applicant briefly described present invention features including detecting access of a secure web site providing an encrypted session by a voice browser and conveying security information to the security system to handle processing of the security information to facilitate a secure encrypted session.


The Examiner believed that none of the cited documents disclosed detection of a secure web site providing encrypted sessions for conveyance of security information to a security system for processing to enable the voice browser to conduct an encrypted session as recited in the proposed claim. However, the Examiner further indicated that an updated search would be required.

Accordingly, and in order to expedite prosecution of the subject application, independent claims 1, 12, 16 and 20 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments. In

particular, independent claim 16 has been amended to recite the feature of the carrier signal having computer program logic embedded therein causing an apparatus to facilitate the secure communications and is considered to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. Further, independent claims 1, 12, 16 and 20 have been amended to include features within the proposed claim and are considered to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims 2 - 11, 13 - 15, 17 - 19 and 21 - 30 are considered to overcome the outstanding rejections for substantially the same reasons discussed above in relation to parent claims 1, 12, 16 and 20.

The application, having been shown to overcome the issues raised in the Office Action, is considered to be in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Stuart B. Shapiro
Registration No. 40,169

EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC
1901 Research Boulevard, Suite 400
Rockville, Maryland 20850-3164
(301) 424-3640

Hand Delivered: November 17, 2005